UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,831	08/12/2005	Jean-Marie Gatto	CYBS5819	2701
86915 Young Law Fire	7590 11/09/200 m. P.C.	EXAMINER		
4370 Alpine Road, Suite 106			PIERCE, DAMON JOSEPH	
Portola Valley, CA 94028			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/520,831	GATTO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	DAMON PIERCE	3714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju	dv 2009					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) X Claim(s) 25-36 47-66 68-89 94-120 and 122-1	33 is/are nending in the application	an				
4) Claim(s) <u>25-36,47-66,68-89,94-120 and 122-133</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
· ·	22 are subject to restriction and/o	r alastian requirement				
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>25-36,47-66,68-89,94-120 and 122-1</u>	<u>55</u> are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some coll None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

Application/Control Number: 10/520,831 Page 2

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The examiner acknowledges the amendments of claims filed on 7/10/09. Claims 1-24, 37-39, 44-46, 67, 90-93, 121, and 134-142 are cancelled. Currently, claims 25-36, 47-66, 68-89, 94-120, and 122-133 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Please note: A restriction requirement is being made at this time due to the applicant's amendments and examiner's understanding of the differences and distinctions of the amended claim language.

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 25-36, and 80-89, 94-100, drawn to a method and an apparatus for operating a gaming machine, classified in class 726, subclass 3.
 - II. Claims 47-66, 68-79, 101-120 and 122-133, drawn to a method and an apparatus for verifying gaming terminal software, classified in class 726, subclass 26.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Inventions I and II are directed to related processes and products. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the

Application/Control Number: 10/520,831

Page 3

Art Unit: 3714

inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect because Invention I provides and installs a trusted verification driver in a gaming machine, and downloads a software module into a gaming machine, whereas, Invention II, blocks the execution of an operating system of the gaming machine, and takes complete control of the gaming machine with at least one driver. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

- 4. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
 - (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
 - (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
 - (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
 - (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

Art Unit: 3714

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. After electing one of the above Inventions of I, or II, an election of species is also required within the elected Invention based on the following species from both of the below groups.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Group I

- I. The species of Fig. 8
- II. The species of Fig. 9
- III. The species of Fig. 10

Group II

- IV. The species of Fig. 11
- V. The species of Fig. 12
- VI. The species of Fig. 13
- VII. The species of Fig. 14

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. Note, in the original specification of instant application see pg. 9, which identifies Figs 8-10 as alternative embodiments; similarly, the original specification of instant application also identifies Figs. 11-14 as alternative embodiments. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, there are no generic.

Page 6

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are

added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAMON PIERCE whose telephone number is (571)270-1997. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dmitry Suhol can be reached on 571-272-4430. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/520,831 Page 8

Art Unit: 3714

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dmitry Suhol/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

DJP